



## 2016 Grants Peer Review Process

### Introduction

The project submission and peer review process is completely online, providing for a secure user experience. Project managers will be able to complete and submit project proposal forms online; peer reviewers will be able to review and score projects assigned; and administrators will be able to access all proposals in order to view, modify and comment on proposals.

### Peer Review Process

Following the nominee application approval, proposals will be randomly assigned to peer reviewers to be scored once the proposal submission window closes on **June 20**. Peer reviewers will receive a pdf file on June 27 containing all of the projects assigned to them and a web link to access a scoring form to input scores for projects assigned. There are two rules governing the assignment process: (1) reviewers must only review and score projects outside of their own region; and (2) projects must be randomly assigned to reviewers for scoring.

There are two scoring areas comprising a project's overall review. The first scoring area refers to the regional criteria, accounting for 40% of the total project score and the second scoring area refers to the non-regional criteria, accounting for 60% of the total project score.

For each of the criteria items, the peer reviewers will use the following scale for their evaluation during the period from June 27 to July 22.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Completely Disagree			Undecided			Completely Agree

After all the projects receive their scores, the results will be tabulated electronically. Award letters and grant allocation will be distributed from August 8 to 12. For more details, refer to 2016 Grants Peer Reviewing Process Timeline handout.

**TABLE 1 REGIONAL SCORING CRITERIA**  
**ACCOUNTS FOR 40% OF THE PROJECT'S OVERALL SCORE**

Regional Criteria	Scoring Definition
Vetted Regionalism	The degree to which applying localities have documented regional support by regional vetting and/or endorsement of the project(s). Provide letters of engagement to demonstrate effective coordination with affected stakeholders. Describe how the project has been regionally screened (i.e. state proposal); example - interoperability, sustainability, addresses special challenges, public institution of higher education.
Scope	The degree to which the project identifies the specific jurisdiction(s), the impact to the adjacent jurisdiction(s) and how the interaction occurs.
Resource sharing	The degree to which the project has a credible plan to share resources with stakeholders
Multi-disciplined	The degree to which the project includes multiple disciplines: fire, police departments, emergency medical services, etc.

**TABLE 2 NON-REGIONAL SCORING CRITERIA**  
**ACCOUNTS FOR 60% OF THE PROJECT'S OVERALL SCORE.**

Non-regional	Scoring Definition
Risk	The degree to which the project addresses risk in terms of threat, vulnerability and consequence. Describe how the project fits state, region, local, and tribal priorities and/or established documented risk. Provide documentation as appropriate (e.g.: THIRA, risk assessments, EOP and links to known or emerging risk.)
Benefit	The degree to which the project describes the benefits to the jurisdiction, region and state. (Describe benefits to their community, region, state, staff and other stakeholders.
Project Management	The degree to which the project manager provides a timeline from grant award to completion (e.g. for State Homeland Security Program projects funded in the past three years, provide evidence they completed their projects).
Collaboration	The degree to which the project has documentation (MOUs, contracts, etc.) that demonstrates collaboration and/or agreement for multiple jurisdictions and/or regions.
Capability Linkage	The degree to which the project identifies and links to core capabilities and preparedness goals.
Whole of Community	The degree to which the project addresses whole-of-community (e.g. Public-Private Partnerships, Speech-Language Pathologies, access and functional needs).
Sustainment	The degree to which the project sustains or enhances a current project or is a new project. If new, the degree to which the equipment, licenses, training and other features will be maintained and upgraded after the period of performance. If the project is for sustainment of a current project, establish the degree to which the outcomes of the previous period(s) of performance were met.
Asset Availability	The degree to which the asset described in the project is available statewide.
Performance Measurement Plan	The degree to which the project's results describe who and what will be evaluated (e.g. describes the overall results that the project is expected to accomplish in qualitative and/or quantitative terms). Some descriptions could include performance measures, national standards and core capabilities.
Project Replication	The degree to which the project can be easily replicated beyond the initial scope or area of initial concern.